

**AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Data Elements**  
**State: Minnesota**  
**Report Period Under Review: October 1, 2004 - March 31, 2005 (2005A)**

<b>AFCARS Element</b>	<b>Data In AFCARS Matches Case File</b>	<b>Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File</b>	<b>Questionable</b>	<b>Not Found</b>	<b>Comments</b>
#5 Most Recent Periodic Review Date	59	15	0	1	<p>There were nine error cases in which the reviewer found a review date that was later than the date reported to AFCARS.</p> <p>There were three dates found by the reviewers that were in February 2005 and another in which the review date found by the reviewer was on March 30<sup>th</sup>.</p> <p>In one error case, the date was missing in the AFCARS report, but the child had been in care for eleven months. The reviewer found a review date.</p>
#6 Child Birth Date	74	1	0	0	
#7 Child Sex	75	0	0	0	
1 = Male 2 = Female					
#8 Child Race	74	1	0	0	An additional race was identified by the reviewer.
a. American Indian or Alaska Native					
b. Asian	75	0	0	0	
c. Black or African American	74	1	0	0	An additional race was identified by the reviewer.
d. Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	75	0	0	0	
e. White	73	2	0	0	An additional race was identified by the reviewers.

**AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Data Elements**  
**State: Minnesota**  
**Report Period Under Review: October 1, 2004 - March 31, 2005 (2005A)**

<b>AFCARS Element</b>	<b>Data In AFCARS Matches Case File</b>	<b>Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File</b>	<b>Questionable</b>	<b>Not Found</b>	<b>Comments</b>
f. Unable to Determine	75	0	0	0	
#9 Child Hispanic Origin  1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = Unable to Determine	75	0	0	0	
#10 Has Child Been Diagnosed with Disability?	65	10	0	0	<p>There were six cases in which the reviewer found diagnosed disabilities and the AFCARS indicated “no.”</p> <p>There was one error case that the AFCARS information indicated “yes,” but the reviewer found the child had no diagnosed disabilities.</p> <p>There was one error case with a reported response of “not yet determined,” and the child had been in care for 11 months.</p> <p>There was another error case with missing data in AFCARS and the child had been in care since 1997.</p> <p>There was one case in which the child was only in care three days by the end of the report period and the AFCARS data indicated a response of “no.” The response should have been “not yet determined.” The reviewer did not find that the child had been seen by a physician by the end of the</p>

**AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Data Elements**  
**State: Minnesota**  
**Report Period Under Review: October 1, 2004 - March 31, 2005 (2005A)**

<b>AFCARS Element</b>	<b>Data In AFCARS Matches Case File</b>	<b>Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File</b>	<b>Questionable</b>	<b>Not Found</b>	<b>Comments</b>
					report period.
#11 Mental Retardation	71	2	2	0	<p>There was one error case that the reviewer found this element did apply.</p> <p>In the other error case the reviewer found that the response should have been “does not apply,” not “applies.”</p> <p>One of the cases marked “questionable” is because the child had been in foster care since 1997.</p>
#12 Visually/Hearing Impaired	71	2	2	0	<p>There was one error case that the reviewer found this element did apply.</p> <p>In the other error case the reviewer found that the response should have been “does not apply,” not “applies.”</p> <p>One of the cases marked “questionable” is because the child had been in foster care since 1997.</p>
#13 Physically Disabled	72	1	2	0	<p>In the error case the response should have been “applies.”</p> <p>One of the cases marked “questionable” is because the child had been in foster care since 1997.</p>
#14 Emotionally Disturbed	64	8	2	1	<p>Six of the error cases were because the response to #10 should have been “yes,” and the reviewer found conditions that mapped to this element.</p>

**AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Data Elements**  
**State: Minnesota**  
**Report Period Under Review: October 1, 2004 - March 31, 2005 (2005A)**

<b>AFCARS Element</b>	<b>Data In AFCARS Matches Case File</b>	<b>Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File</b>	<b>Questionable</b>	<b>Not Found</b>	<b>Comments</b>
					In two error cases, the response should have been "applies."  One of the cases marked "questionable" is because the child had been in foster care since 1997.
#15 Other Diagnosed Condition	62	11	2	0	There were four cases in error because of incorrect mapping; the response should have been "applies."  There were five error cases because the reviewer found an additional condition.  There were two cases reported as "applies" that should have been "does not apply."  One of the cases marked "questionable" is because the child had been in foster care since 1997.
#16 Has Child Ever Been Adopted?  1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = Unable to Determine	70	4	1	0	In all of the error cases the reviewer found that the child had been previously adopted. The AFCARS response was "no."
#17 Age at Previous Adoption  0 = Not Applicable 1 = less than 2 years old	71	4	0	0	

**AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Data Elements**  
**State: Minnesota**  
**Report Period Under Review: October 1, 2004 - March 31, 2005 (2005A)**

<b>AFCARS Element</b>	<b>Data In AFCARS Matches Case File</b>	<b>Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File</b>	<b>Questionable</b>	<b>Not Found</b>	<b>Comments</b>
2 = 2-5 years old 3 = 6-12 years old 4 = 13 years or older 5 = Unable to Determine					
#18 Date of First Removal from Home	52	21	2	0	<p>In two of the error cases, the date found for the date of removal was earlier than what was reported to AFCARS (child only had one removal).</p> <p>In ten cases, the date found the date of removal was earlier than what was reported to AFCARS (child had more than one removal).</p> <p>In five of the error cases, the reviewer found a later date than what was reported to AFCARS.</p> <p>In one error case, the child had been in the hospital at the time the agency obtained responsibility for care and placement. The reported removal date reflected the start date of the hospitalization instead of the date the child entered "foster care."</p> <p>In one case, the reviewer noted that twins were born drug addicted. One child left the hospital after four days. The other, the child in the sample, was in the hospital for a week and a half. The date reported in AFCARS reflects the day the first sibling left the</p>

**AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Data Elements**  
**State: Minnesota**  
**Report Period Under Review: October 1, 2004 - March 31, 2005 (2005A)**

<b>AFCARS Element</b>	<b>Data In AFCARS Matches Case File</b>	<b>Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File</b>	<b>Questionable</b>	<b>Not Found</b>	<b>Comments</b>
					hospital.  In one of the “questionable” cases the reviewer noted there may have been involvement in foster care prior to the date reported as the first removal.
#19 Total Number of Removals from Home	58	16	1	0	There were ten error cases that had more removals than what was reported to AFCARS.  There were four error cases that had one less removal than what was reported to AFCARS.  In two error cases, the reported dates of first removal (#18) and latest removal (#21) were not the same, but the number of removals reported was one.
#20 Date of Discharge from Previous Episode	61	12	2	0	There were seven error cases because there was actually more than one removal and no date was reported for this element.  There were two error cases because there was only one removal, but two removals were reported.  Two of the error cases were due to the dates of first removal (#18) and latest removal (#21) reported to AFCARS not being the same, and there was not a date of discharge reported for this element.

**AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Data Elements**  
**State: Minnesota**  
**Report Period Under Review: October 1, 2004 - March 31, 2005 (2005A)**

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
					One case is “questionable” because the reviewer could not find any discharge dates in the file that made sense. There appears to be two dates that may be discharges, but it is not clear, and the reviewer was not able to determine who the child was discharged to.
#21 Date of Latest Removal	58	16	1	0	<p>In two of the error case, the date found for the date of removal was earlier than what was reported to AFCARS (child only had one removal.).</p> <p>Four error cases had dates of removal that were earlier than what was reported to AFCARS (child had more than one removal).</p> <p>There was one case in which the reviewer found a later date than what was reported to AFCARS (six days).</p> <p>In one error case, the child had been in the hospital at the time the agency obtained responsibility for care and placement. The reported removal date reflected the start date of the hospitalization instead of the date the child entered “foster care.”</p> <p>There were three error cases where the child had only one removal, not two as reported. Therefore, this date should have been the same as what was reported in element #18.</p>

**AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Data Elements**  
**State: Minnesota**  
**Report Period Under Review: October 1, 2004 - March 31, 2005 (2005A)**

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
					<p>In one case, the reviewer noted that twins were born drug addicted. One child left the hospital after four days. The other, the child in the sample, was in the hospital for a week and a half. The date reported in AFCARS reflects the day the first sibling left the hospital.</p> <p>One case is “questionable” because the reviewer could not find any discharge dates in the file that made sense. There appears to be two dates that may be discharges, but it is not clear, and the reviewer was not able to determine who the child was discharged to. Also, the date reported as the date of current removal is after the dates of TPR. The reviewer did find a date of removal that is earlier than the one reported for element #18.</p>
#23 Date of Placement in Current Setting	68	6	1	0	<p>In one case, the reviewer noted that twins were born drug addicted. One child left the hospital after four days the other, the child in the sample, was in the hospital for a week and a half. The date reported in AFCARS reflects the day the first sibling left the hospital.</p>
#24 Number of Previous Placement Settings in This Episode	58	15	1	1	<p>In four error cases the reviewer found fewer moves than what were reported in AFCARS.</p> <p>In 11 error cases the reviewer found more</p>



**AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Data Elements**  
**State: Minnesota**  
**Report Period Under Review: October 1, 2004 - March 31, 2005 (2005A)**

<b>AFCARS Element</b>	<b>Data In AFCARS Matches Case File</b>	<b>Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File</b>	<b>Questionable</b>	<b>Not Found</b>	<b>Comments</b>
					moves than what were reported in AFCARS.
#25 Manner of Removal From Home for This Episode  1 = Voluntary 2 = Court Ordered 3 = Not Yet Determined	63	12	0	0	There were eight cases reported as “court ordered,” but the reviewer noted it was a “voluntary” removal.  There was one case reported as “not yet determined” and the child was in care for six months. The reviewer found that a voluntary agreement was in place.  There were error cases and either the AFCARS response was “not yet determined” (one), or it was blank (two). Reviewers found court orders for the removals.
#26 Physical Abuse	71	4	0	0	The cases were reported as “does not apply” and the reviewer found that it did apply.
#27 Sexual Abuse	72	3	0	0	There was one case reported as “does not apply” and the reviewer found that it did apply.  There were two cases reported as “applies” and the reviewer found that it did not apply.
#28 Neglect	62	13	0	0	There were ten cases reported as “does not apply” and the reviewer found that it did apply.  There were three cases reported as “applies” and the reviewer found that it did not apply.

**AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Data Elements**  
**State: Minnesota**  
**Report Period Under Review: October 1, 2004 - March 31, 2005 (2005A)**

<b>AFCARS Element</b>	<b>Data In AFCARS Matches Case File</b>	<b>Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File</b>	<b>Questionable</b>	<b>Not Found</b>	<b>Comments</b>
#29 Parent Alcohol Abuse	66	9	0	0	There were nine cases reported as “does not apply” and the reviewer found that it did apply.
#30 Parent Drug Abuse	66	9	0	0	There were eight cases reported as “does not apply” and the reviewer found that it did apply.  There was one case reported as “applies” and the reviewer found that it did not apply.
#31 Child Alcohol Abuse	69	6	0	0	The cases were reported as “applies” and the reviewer found that it did not apply.
#32 Child Drug Abuse	73	2	0	0	The cases were reported as “does not apply” and the reviewer found that it did apply.
#33 Child Disability	72	3	0	0	The cases were reported as “does not apply” and the reviewer found that it did apply.
#34 Child's Behavior Problem	69	5	1	0	There was one case reported as “does not apply” and the reviewer found that it did apply.  There were four cases reported as “applies” and the reviewer found that it did not apply.  Questionable: The reviewer indicated a question mark in the data from the paper file. It is unclear if this means that the condition was found in the paper file.
#35 Death of Parent	74	1	0	0	The case was reported as “does not apply” and the reviewer found that it did apply.
#36 Incarceration of Parent	73	2	0	0	The cases were reported as “does not apply” and the reviewer found that it did apply.

**AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Data Elements**  
**State: Minnesota**  
**Report Period Under Review: October 1, 2004 - March 31, 2005 (2005A)**

<b>AFCARS Element</b>	<b>Data In AFCARS Matches Case File</b>	<b>Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File</b>	<b>Questionable</b>	<b>Not Found</b>	<b>Comments</b>
#37 Caretaker Inability to Cope	70	5	0	0	The cases were reported as “does not apply” and the reviewer found that it did apply.
#38 Abandonment	73	1	1	0	The case was reported as “applies” and the reviewer found that it did not apply.  Questionable: Reviewer indicated a question mark in the data from the paper file. Unclear if this means that the condition was found in the paper file.
#39 Relinquishment	75	0	0	0	
#40 Inadequate Housing	73	2	0	0	There was one case reported as “does not apply” and the reviewer found that it did apply.  There was one case reported as “applies” and the reviewer found that it did not apply.
#41 Current Placement Setting  1 = Pre-Adoptive Home 2 = Foster Family Home (Relative) 3 = Foster Family Home (Non-Relative) 4 = Group Home 5 = Institution 6 = Supervised Independent Living 7 = Runaway 8 = Trial Home Visit	71	4	0	0	In one error case, the child was a runaway but the living arrangement was reported as “group home.”  Note: One error case was marked in error because the reported setting was non-relative and the reviewer marked relative and added a note saying it met the State’s definition of relative.

**AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Data Elements**  
**State: Minnesota**  
**Report Period Under Review: October 1, 2004 - March 31, 2005 (2005A)**

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments	
#42 Out of State Placement	75	0	0	0		
#43 Most Recent Case Plan Goal  1 = Reunify with Parent(s) or Principal Caretaker(s) 2 = Live with Other Relative(s) 3 = Adoption 4 = Long Term Foster Care 5 = Emancipation 6 = Guardianship 7 = Case Plan Goal Not Yet Established	62	13	0	0	Reported as:	Reviewer found:
					Reunify	Long-term foster care (3)
					Reunify	Emancipation
					Reunify	Adoption
					Reunify	TLC(?)
					Live with other relative	Long-term foster care
					Adoption	Long-term foster care
					Adoption	Emancipation
					Long-term foster care	Emancipation
					Emancipation	Long-term foster care
					Guardianship	Long-term foster care
					Not yet determined	Emancipation (child in care for 12 years)
					#44 Caretaker Family Structure  1 = Married Couple 2 = Unmarried Couple 3 = Single Female 4 = Single Male 5 = Unable to Determine	67
#45 1 <sup>st</sup> Primary Caretaker's Birth Year	69	5	0	1	Five cases were reported as blank and element #44 was “single female.” The reviewers found a date of birth.	
#46 2 <sup>nd</sup> Primary	67	6	0	2	There was one error in data entry.	

**AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Data Elements**  
**State: Minnesota**  
**Report Period Under Review: October 1, 2004 - March 31, 2005 (2005A)**

<b>AFCARS Element</b>	<b>Data In AFCARS Matches Case File</b>	<b>Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File</b>	<b>Questionable</b>	<b>Not Found</b>	<b>Comments</b>
Caretaker's Birth Year					Four cases were incorrect because element #44 was wrong. In three cases, the reviewer found the caretakers' family structure as "unmarried couple;" the other was a "married couple."  In one error case, a date was reported, but element #44 was "single female."
#47 Mother's Date of TPR	62	13	0	0	Nine of the error cases were missing the information in AFCARS and the reviewers found dates of TPR  One error case was reported as blank, but reviewer found a deceased date.  There was one error in data entry.
#48 Father's Date of TPR	65	10	0	0	All of the error cases were missing the information in AFCARS and the reviewers found dates of TPR.
#49 Foster Family Structure  0 = Not Applicable 1 = Married Couple 2 = Unmarried Couple 3 = Single Female 4 = Single Male	73	2	0	0	
#50 1 <sup>st</sup> Foster Caretaker's Birth Year	66	9	0	0	In eight error cases, element #49 was "married couple" and this information was missing.

**AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Data Elements**  
**State: Minnesota**  
**Report Period Under Review: October 1, 2004 - March 31, 2005 (2005A)**

<b>AFCARS Element</b>	<b>Data In AFCARS Matches Case File</b>	<b>Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File</b>	<b>Questionable</b>	<b>Not Found</b>	<b>Comments</b>
#51 2 <sup>nd</sup> Foster Caretaker's Birth Year	63	12	0	0	In nine error cases, element #49 was “married couple” and this information was missing.  In one error case, the reviewer found that element #49 was a married couple, but the information reported was a single caretaker. Also, the reviewer found a date of birth.
#52 1 <sup>st</sup> Foster Caretaker's Race	74	1	0	0	Element #49 was “married couple” and all race categories were reported as “no.” The reviewer found the information.
a. American Indian or Alaska Native					
b. Asian	74	1	0	0	Element #49 was “married couple” and all race categories were reported as “no.” The reviewer found the information.
c. Black or African American	73	2	0	0	Element #49 was “married couple” and all race categories were reported as “no.” The reviewer found the information.
d. Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	75	0	0	0	
e. White	70	5	0	0	Element #49 was “married couple” and all race categories were reported as “no.” The reviewer found the information.
f. Unable to Determine	75	0	0	0	
#53 1 <sup>st</sup> Foster Caretaker's Hispanic Origin	66	9	0	0	In eight error cases, element #49 was “married couple” and this information was missing.  One error case was reported as “no,” but the

**AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Data Elements**  
**State: Minnesota**  
**Report Period Under Review: October 1, 2004 - March 31, 2005 (2005A)**

<b>AFCARS Element</b>	<b>Data In AFCARS Matches Case File</b>	<b>Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File</b>	<b>Questionable</b>	<b>Not Found</b>	<b>Comments</b>
					reviewer found that the individual is Hispanic.
#54 2 <sup>nd</sup> Foster Caretaker's Race	72	2	0	1	Element #49 was “married couple” and all race categories were reported as “no.” The reviewer found the information.
a. American Indian or Alaska Native					In one error case the reviewer found an additional race.
b. Asian	71	3	0	1	Element #49 was “married couple” and all race categories were reported as “no.” The reviewer found the information.
c. Black or African American	70	4	0	1	Element #49 was “married couple” and all race categories were reported as “no.” The reviewer found the information.
d. Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	73	1	0	1	Element #49 was “married couple” and all race categories were reported as “no.” The reviewer found the information.
e. White	69	5	0	1	Element #49 was “married couple” and all race categories were reported as “no.” The reviewer found the information.
					One error case was because an additional race was found.
f. Unable to Determine	73	1	0	1	Element #49 was “married couple” and all race categories were reported as “no.” The reviewer found the information.
#55 2 <sup>nd</sup> Foster Caretaker's Hispanic Origin	66	9	0	0	In eight error cases, element #49 was “married couple” and this information was missing.

**AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Data Elements**  
**State: Minnesota**  
**Report Period Under Review: October 1, 2004 - March 31, 2005 (2005A)**

<b>AFCARS Element</b>	<b>Data In AFCARS Matches Case File</b>	<b>Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File</b>	<b>Questionable</b>	<b>Not Found</b>	<b>Comments</b>
					One error case was reported as “no,” but the reviewer found that the individual is Hispanic.
#56 Date of Discharge	71	2	2		<p>One error case is due to the child reported as reunified when the child actually ran away. There was no indication that the child was found and placed back in foster care.</p> <p>One error case indicated the child turned 18 during the report period and was not receiving title IV-E.</p> <p>One of the questionable cases had a date of discharge and the reason for discharge was “runaway.”</p>
#58 Reason for Discharge  0 = Not Applicable 1 = Reunification with Parent(s) or Primary Caretaker(s) 2 = Living with Other Relative(s) 3 = Adoption 4 = Emancipation 5 = Guardianship 6 = Transfer to Another Agency 7 = Runaway	69	3	3	0	<p>One of the error cases had “guardianship” as the discharge reason and the reviewer found “reunification.”</p> <p>One error case was due to a child reported as reunified, when the child actually ran away and there was no indication that the child was found and placed back in foster care.</p> <p>One error case indicated the child turned 18 during the report period and was not receiving title IV-E.</p>



**AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Data Elements**  
**State: Minnesota**  
**Report Period Under Review: October 1, 2004 - March 31, 2005 (2005A)**

<b>AFCARS Element</b>	<b>Data In AFCARS Matches Case File</b>	<b>Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File</b>	<b>Questionable</b>	<b>Not Found</b>	<b>Comments</b>
8 = Death of Child					In one questionable record, the discharge reason was “runaway,” but it was two days later than the child’s 18 <sup>th</sup> birthday.  One of the questionable cases had a date of discharge and the reason for discharge was “runaway.”  One of the questionable cases was reported as “guardianship” and reviewer wrote “transfer to relative.”
#59 Title IV-E Foster Care	63	5	0	7	There were five cases reported as “does not apply” and the reviewer found that it did apply.
#60 Title IV-E Adoption	69	0	0	6	
#61 Title IV-A AFDC	64	2	0	9	There was one case reported as “does not apply” and the reviewer found that it did apply.  There was one case reported as “applies” and the reviewer found that it did not apply.
#62 Title IV-D Child Support	63	2	0	10	Two cases were reported as “applies,” but the reviewer found that it did not apply. In one instance the reviewer noted that the parent’s rights were terminated several years previous to the report period.
#63 Title XIX Medicaid	69	4	0	2	There were four cases reported as “does not apply” and the reviewer found that it did apply.
#64 SSI	60	8	0	7	There were six cases reported as “does not

**AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Foster Care Data Elements**  
**State: Minnesota**  
**Report Period Under Review: October 1, 2004 - March 31, 2005 (2005A)**

<b>AFCARS Element</b>	<b>Data In AFCARS Matches Case File</b>	<b>Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File</b>	<b>Questionable</b>	<b>Not Found</b>	<b>Comments</b>
					apply” and the reviewer found that it did apply. There were two cases that had missing information. In one, the reviewer found the information.
#65 None of the Above	71	1	0	3	There were two cases that had missing information. In one, the reviewer found the information.
#66 Monthly Amount	25	38	2	10	

# AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Adoption Data Elements

State: Minnesota

Report Period Under Review: October 1, 2004 - March 31, 2005 (2005A)

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
#4 State Agency Involvement  1 = Yes 2 = No	30	0	0	0	
#5 Child Date of Birth	30	0	0	0	
#6 Child Sex  1 = Male 2 = Female	29	1	0	0	
#7 Child Race  a. American Indian or Alaska Native	27	3	0	0	In two of the error cases, the reviewer found an additional race that was not reported.  The other error case is due to the reviewer finding a race and the AFCARS data indicated "unable to determine" applied.
b. Asian	30	0	0	0	
c. Black or African American	29	1	0	0	The reviewer found a race and the AFCARS data indicated that "unable to determine" was "applies."
d. Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	30	0	0	0	
e. White	29	1	0	0	The reviewer found a race and the AFCARS data indicated that "unable to determine" was "applies."
f. Unable to Determine	29	1	0	0	The error case is due to the reviewer finding a race and the AFCARS data indicated "unable to determine" applied.

# AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Adoption Data Elements

State: Minnesota

Report Period Under Review: October 1, 2004 - March 31, 2005 (2005A)

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
#8 Child Hispanic Origin  1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = Unable to Determine	30	0	0	0	
#9 Has Agency Determined Special Needs	28	2	0	0	The error cases were reported as “no,” but element #35 was reported as the child receiving a monthly subsidy. The reviewer found that the child had a diagnosed medical condition.
#10 Primary Basis for Determining Special Needs  0 = Not Applicable 1 = Racial/Original Background 2 = Age 3 = Membership in a Sibling Group 4 = Medical Conditions or Mental, Physical or Emotional Disabilities 5 = Other	22	6	2	0	<p>One of the error cases was reported as “medical conditions or mental, physical or emotional disabilities,” but the reviewer found that the child was at risk of medical/emotional factors.</p> <p>Two error cases were reported as “not applicable,” but element #35 was reported as the child receiving a monthly subsidy. The reviewer found that the child had a diagnosed medical condition in one case and the other the child was at-risk for future medical disabilities.</p> <p>Two of the error cases were incorrect because the AFCARS information reflected the wrong category.</p> <p>One of the questionable cases had all of elements #11 - 15 as “applies,” but the reviewer noted the child was part of a</p>

# AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Adoption Data Elements

State: Minnesota

Report Period Under Review: October 1, 2004 - March 31, 2005 (2005A)

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
					<p>sibling group and there was not documentation supporting the diagnosis of disabilities.</p> <p>The other questionable case had this element reported as “medical conditions or mental, physical or emotional disabilities,” but the reviewer found that it had been treated and found no other medical conditions.</p>
#11 Mental Retardation	27	1	2	0	One of the questionable cases had all of elements #11 - 15 as “applies,” but the reviewer noted the child was part of a sibling group and there was not documentation supporting the diagnosis of disabilities.
#12 Visually/Hearing Impaired	28	0	2	0	One of the questionable cases had all of elements #11 - 15 as “applies,” but the reviewer noted the child was part of a sibling group and there was not documentation supporting the diagnosis of disabilities.
#13 Physically Disabled	27	1	2	0	<p>The error case was reported as “medical conditions or mental, physical or emotional disabilities” in element #10, but the reviewer found that the child was at risk of medical/emotional factors. This element was incorrectly reported as “applies.”</p> <p>One of the questionable cases had all of elements #11 - 15 as “applies,” but the</p>

# AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Adoption Data Elements

State: Minnesota

Report Period Under Review: October 1, 2004 - March 31, 2005 (2005A)

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
					reviewer noted the child was part of a sibling group and there was not documentation supporting the diagnosis of disabilities.
#14 Emotionally Disturbed	24	4	2	0	<p>One of the error cases was reported as “medical conditions or mental, physical or emotional disabilities” in element #10, but the reviewer found that the child was at risk of medical/emotional factors. This element was incorrectly reported as “applies.”</p> <p>In one error case, the reviewer found this element did not apply because the information reported in element #10 was not “medical conditions or mental, physical or emotional disabilities.”</p> <p>One error cases indicated that this should have been “applies,” instead of “does not apply.”</p> <p>One of the questionable cases had all of elements #11 - 15 as “applies,” but the reviewer noted the child was part of a sibling group and there was not documentation supporting the diagnosis of disabilities.</p>
#15 Other Diagnosed Condition	25	3	2	0	One error case is because the condition did apply and elements #9 and 10 were not marked as applying.

# AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Adoption Data Elements

State: Minnesota

Report Period Under Review: October 1, 2004 - March 31, 2005 (2005A)

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
					<p>In two error cases, the reviewer found this element did not apply because the information reported in element #10 was not “medical conditions or mental, physical or emotional disabilities.”</p> <p>One of the questionable cases had all of elements #11 - 15 as “applies,” but the reviewer noted the child was part of a sibling group and there was not documentation supporting the diagnosis of disabilities.</p>
#16 Mother's Birth Year	30	0	0	0	
#17 Father's Birth Year	27	3	0	0	The error cases were all reported as blank, but the reviewers found dates of birth.
#18 Mother Married at Time of Birth  1 = Yes 2 = No 3 = Unable to Determine	29	1	0	0	The AFCARS report reflected missing information, but the reviewer found the information.
#19 Date of Mother's TPR	26	4	0	0	<p>In two error cases the reviewer found an earlier date than what was reported in AFCARS.</p> <p>In one error case the data was missing, but the reviewer found that the mother was deceased.</p>
#20 Date of Father's TPR	27	3	0	0	In one error case the reviewer found an earlier date than what was reported in

# AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Adoption Data Elements

State: Minnesota

Report Period Under Review: October 1, 2004 - March 31, 2005 (2005A)

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
					AFCARS.  In one error case the data was missing, but the reviewer found that the father was deceased.
#21 Date Adoption Legalized	30	0	0	0	
#22 Adoptive Family Structure  1 = Married Couple 2 = Unmarried Couple 3 = Single Female 4 = Single Male	29	1	0	0	
#23 Adoptive Mother's Year of Birth	30	0	0	0	
#24 Adoptive Father's Year of Birth	29	1	0	0	The error case was reported as blank, but the reviewer found the information.
#25 Adoptive Mother's Race  a. American Indian or Alaska Native	30	0	0	0	
b. Asian	30	0	0	0	
c. Black or African American	29	1	0	0	The error case is due to the reviewer finding a race and the AFCARS data indicated "unable to determine" applied.
d. Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	30	0	0	0	



# AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Adoption Data Elements

State: Minnesota

Report Period Under Review: October 1, 2004 - March 31, 2005 (2005A)

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
e. White	30	0	0	0	
f. Unable to Determine	29	1	0	0	The error case is due to the reviewer finding a race and the AFCARS data indicated "unable to determine" applied.
#26 Adoptive Mother's Hispanic Origin	30	0	0	0	
#27 Adoptive Father's Race	30	0	0	0	
a. American Indian or Alaska Native					
b. Asian	30	0	0	0	
c. Black or African American	30	0	0	0	
d. Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander	30	0	0	0	
e. White	30	0	0	0	
f. Unable to Determine	30	0	0	0	
#28 Adoptive Father's Hispanic Origin	30	0	0	0	
#29 Relationship of Adoptive Parent to Child - Stepparent	30	0	0	0	
#30 Relationship of Adoptive Parent to Child - Other Relative	29	1	0	0	The reviewer found this condition applied.
#31 Relationship of Adoptive Parent to Child -	22	8	0	0	In all of the error cases, there was an additional relationship found that was not reported in AFCARS.

# AFCARS Assessment Review Case File Findings: Adoption Data Elements

State: Minnesota

Report Period Under Review: October 1, 2004 - March 31, 2005 (2005A)

AFCARS Element	Data In AFCARS Matches Case File	Data In AFCARS Does Not Match Paper File	Questionable	Not Found	Comments
Foster Parent					
#32 Relationship of Adoptive Parent to Child - Other Non-Relative	27	3	0	0	In one of the error cases there was an additional relationship found that was not reported in AFCARS.  One error case was reported as “applies” in addition to element #31. The reviewer found this element did not apply. In one error case, the AFCARS data showed that it applied and the reviewer indicated it did not apply.
#33 Child Was Placed from 1 = Within State 2 = Another State 3 = Another Country	30	0	0	0	
#34 Child Was Placed by  1 = Public Agency 2 = Private Agency 3 = Tribal Agency 4 = Independent Person 5 = Birth Parent	30	0	0	0	
#35 Receiving Monthly Subsidy	29	0	0	1	
#36 Monthly Amount	26	2	0	2	
#37 Adoption Assistance	29	0	0	1	